DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 351 255 SO 022 508

TITLE	Enemy Images, Developmental Psychology, And Peace Education. Peace Education Miniprints No. 29. Petra Hesse and the Project "Preparedness for Peace."
INSTITUTION	Lund Univ. (Sweden). Malmo School of Education.
REPORT NO	ISSN-1101-6418
PUB DATE	Apr 92
NOTE	21p.
AVAILABLE FROM	"Preparedness for Peace," School of Education, Box 23501, S-200 45 Malmo, Sweden.
PUB TYPE	Information Analyses (070)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Child Development; *Child Psychology; Developmental Psychology; Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; International Education; International Studies; *Nuclear Warfare; *Peace; Teaching Methods; War
IDENTIFIERS	*Center for Psychological Stud in the Nuc Age MA; *Peace Education

ABSTRACT

An interview on peace education with Petra Hesse, of the Center for Psychological Studies in the Nuclear Age (Cambridge, Massachusetts), is presented. The Center for Psychological Studies in the Nuclear Age was founded out of a concern about children's fears of the future and the risks of nuclear war. Petra Hesse coordinates a research project on children's and adolescents' images of the enemy and is interested in an integration of education for media literacy for multicultural awareness and for creative conflict resolution. (Author)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED351255

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

A. BJERSTEDT

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SO 022 508

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ENEMY IMAGES, DEVELOPMENTAL PSYCHOLOGY, AND PEACE EDUCATION

Petra Hesse
and
The Project "Preparedness for Peace"

This miniprint presents an interview on peace education with Petra Hesse, Center for Psychological Studies in the Nuclear Age, Cambridge, MA, and Wheelock College, Boston, MA, USA. (Interviewer: Åke Bjerstedt.)

The Center for Psychological Studies in the Nuclear Age was founded out of a concern about children's fears of the future and the risks of nuclear war. Petra Hesse coordinates a research project on children's and adolescents' images of the enemy and is interested in an integration of education for media literacy, for multicultural awareness and for creative conflict resolution.

PEACE EDUCATION: A CONVERSATION WITH PETRA HESSE, CENTER FOR PSYCHOLOGICAL STUDIES IN THE NUCLEAR AGE, CAMBRIDGE, MA, AND WHEELOCK COLLEGE, BOSTON, MA, USA

1.

ÅB: As an introduction, could you say a few words about yourself and your interest in the field of "peace education"?

PH: I think most recently I became interested in peace education because I have been teaching at a college that trains teachers, and I know that many teachers are very much concerned about conflicts and conflict resolution in their classrooms. I teach courses on political, social and emotional development. Somehow I think the content of the courses I teach and the concern of my students converge in my interest in children's social development, conflict resolution, and political development.

In America, many teachers are particularly interested in conflict resolution in their classrooms because of the deregulation of children's television in the early 1980s, which has led to a situation where there are no clear limits any more on the amount of violence that can be shown on this television.The incidents of violence have increased on many children's TV programs, and as a result teachers see a lot more war games in their classrooms. It's almost a socio-cultural phenomenon. When there is an increase in violence in the classrooms, teachers really feel a need to do something about it.

In terms of my more longstanding interest, the fact that I grew up in Germany, I think, means that I have carried with me a certain amount of guilt about the Holocaust. So there is a sort of long-standing interest in the prevention of war, in how to prevent stereotyping that easily leads to violence, eventually to the kind of violence that occurred during the Holocaust. So I think there has been some kind of sensitization that has been with me for a long period of time.

ÅB: How long were you in Germany?

PH: I lived in Germany for the first 22 years of my life, so I went through elementary and high school and three years of college there before I came to the States.

ÅB: Could you also tell me something about your present work?

PH: Currently I am an assistant professor of human development. At a very small college in Boston I am teaching courses not just of human development, but also on social psychology and clinical psychology. It's a teachers' training college. Then I am also a research associate at the Center for

Psychological Studies in the Nuclear Age, which was founded a few years ago out of a concern about children's fears of the future and children's concerns about nuclear war.

To summarize the nature of my research work, I coordinate a research project on children's and adolescents' images of the enemy and have more recently become more interested in an integration of media literacy, multi-cultural and conflict resolution education. My work on children's television is a spin-off of my research on children's images of the enemy. I became interested in the images of the enemy on children's television, because many children told me that they get their ideas about good guys and bad guys from children's television.

2.

ÅB: What do you think of first when you hear the words "peace education"?

PH: Well, it's biased by what my own work is about, so I think first of classrooms with small children, primarily kindergarten and elementary schools and our own work on peace education. I think of multi-cultural education, making children appreciate the differences in customs, habits, language – the physical differences in cultures as well as the more subtle emotional and social differences.

My own research indicates that children are wary of people who look different, people who are strangers, people who somehow speak differently, look differently or have slightly different habits. So when I think of peace education, ideally I think of completely multi-cultural classrooms, where children representing different races and different cultures are combined, but whether that's possible depends very much on where you conduct your peace education. I also think of peace education as a training of children in empathy with people who are different. So basically I believe that peace education should consist of making sure that children can identify with people who might be different from them. I can see from my own research that young children have a tough time taking the perspective of others. Therefore, they should be encouraged and trained while still young to take the perspective of others. Then it also relates to my research on children's media in this country, where children are systematically taught that somebody who looks different is evil. That's a very common theme in children's cartoon shows. I want children to see the similarities between themselves and other people, they should feel for other people who are in pain.

And then I think of peace education as a training in conflict resolution skills that does acknowledge that children as well as adults are often in conflict. The fact that human beings are often in conflict, and are often aggressive doesn't mean that their conflicts have to lead to violence. So what we have been encouraging is creative conflict resolution in the classroom, letting children brainstorm about alternatives to punching each other: What are some of the strategies that can be used? Can they always use words, or are there alternatives to using words? How do they come to some kind of agreement on or resolution of their conflicts that is short of violence but also doesn't ignore the conflict? I definitely don't believe in ignoring conflicts.

In the classroom we may let the children pledge their allegiance to the planet, encouraging children to empathize with other groups. But I also think that something has to happen to get children to have a relationship with nature, to have a relationship with people all over the world and also with the whole earth. Hence I think part of peace education should also be some form of environmental education. I would also encourage them to identify with other species, like animals and nature that is threatened by environmental destruction. I would encourage children at an early age to do things that they can do. I would like to empower even very young children to feel that they can make a difference in the world. Even five-year-olds can do a few things to contribute to cleaning up the environment, for example.

3.

ÅB: If you think back on your own school days, were there some aspects in your schooling that might be considered an attempt at "peace education"?

PH: It's an interesting question. As far as I remember, I would say peace education started sometime in high school. That wasn't *called* peace education, but typically happened as part of our social studies or history lessons. I remember a couple of teachers, very young teachers, who I think were concerned about the Holocaust, who systematically exposed us children to Nazi Germany and what happened to the Jews during Nazi Germany, showed us films of concentration camps etc.

I don't have a sense of it as being something that was school-wide and that was really institutionalized and was part of the mandated curriculum. Rather, it was something that individual teachers took upon themselves. I definitely remember one social studies teacher who (in the 8th or 9th grade) actually did a lot of things with us. He went to factories with us, he

really made some attempts to do a social class analysis of Germany, to educate us about environmental issues at the time, to get us to explore what our goals in the world were etc.

ÅB: What year would this be?

PH: I was born in 1955, so that would have been in the late 60s, early 70s. Those teachers were young teachers trying to implement some of their ideals in their own classrooms, and it's interesting because it's different from how I define peace education. Those teachers had a commitment to educating us about Germany's past, to making us politically active and socially responsible. One particular teacher (I think he taught me when I was 14) actually read some sort of peace research writings with us, including a Galtung-type sociological analysis. They were very much concerned about the third world and structural injustices.

4.

ÅB: Do you believe that schools in your country, as you know them today, contribute to a "peace education"?

PH: It's hard to tell, because I think in the United States it really differs from state to state. But there is definitely a trend towards more and more interest in peace education, especially among younger teachers and in part for the reasons I mentioned initially. I think there are a lot of teachers in this country who have become very much concerned about inner city violence. Teachers who teach in inner cities are very much concerned about gang violence, and, as I said earlier, about violence that seems to be in part promoted by the media, violence that children seem to copy from the media. The frustration of city poverty has also contributed to the gang violence. A lot of teachers have begun to feel that they have to do something about it, and, I think, because of that are really struggling to implement more peace education in their classrooms.

But I'm also aware of an institutionalization of peace education. I know that a bunch of groups have come into being during the last 10 or 15 years. A prominent one is Educators for Social Responsibility, who are organizing all over the country and who have peace education projects in schools all over the country and are training people to be peace educators. Basically they conduct workshops for teachers. I have no idea what percentage of schools actually have peace education projects, but I know that there are whole school systems now that have peace education in this sense as part of their curriculum.

ÅB: You started by talking about inner city violence as a motivating force,

and about peace education as promoting non-violent problem solving within the classroom or within the city. Would you also say that the global aspects of peace education are attended to, or do you think that they are dealt with to a lesser extent?

PH: I think that global aspects of peace education are dealt with to a lesser extent. But I think there is beginning to be more environmental education. I visit a lot of schools and have seen signs of environmental education everywhere, for example, at the front of science teachers' classrooms. I have a feeling that science teachers as well as literature and social studies teachers talk about environmental issues, and I think there is a greater global focus in this country as far as environmental education is concerned, whereas most peace education programs actually focus on resolving children's conflicts in the classroom. I feel that's where I and my co-worker Debby come in. Given that I grew up in Germany, I have a much more international perspective.

To me peace education should always educate, not just about other cultures in this country, but also about other world cultures. On children's television the enemy tends to be an Asian or a fascist with a German accent (there are still lots of Nazis on kids' television) and then there are Eastern Europeans and Arabs. We had lots of enemy Arabs on children's television long before the Gulf crisis started. So on children's television, foreigners from other cultures tend to be portrayed as the enemy. Because of that I believe that peace education should expose children to other countries, people in other countries, people who speak totally different languages.

I sometimes find that I'm more interested in nationalism and nationalistic issues, whereas I think people in the United States are much more concerned about racial tension. To me peace education should deal with *both* these aspects: racism and nationalism.

5.

ÅB: Do you think it is at all possible for schools to contribute to a "peace education"? If so, what are some of the steps and measures to be taken that you think of first?

PH: Yes, in terms of content I think it's definitely possible for schools to make room for peace education, and I don't see peace education as something that's simply added to children's curricula. I think that's important, and I think we have been working on a very integrated curriculum

in our work. Issues of conflict and peace and conflict resolution turn up in all parts of the curriculum, so it's no longer just restricted to social studies, but you can talk about a conflict when you talk about math. You can use simple classification tasks, asking children to bring in pictures of people from different countries. You can combine basic math instruction that occurs in elementary school, teaching children to add and subtract and things like that, with introducing children to other cultures. I really think this is possible throughout the curriculum: whether it's in music, and you sing songs about other cultures; or whether it's in literature, where you read stories from other cultures or show children and families from other cultures; or whether it's in art education, where you may show children art from different cultures.

ÅB: So you feel it's very possible to introduce peace education materials in various subjects and at various school levels. If you think of it in terms of outcome, has there been research related to the results of peace education?

PH: There are a lot of impressionistic accounts where people describe what a peace education program has achieved in their classrooms or in the school system. But I'm not personally aware of any more systematic evaluation research. And there are great difficulties in such work. Are you going to conduct questionnaires with kids and ask them about their attitudes? Then you meet with that old problem again: how do the attitudes translate into action, and is there a relationship between the two? Or do you measure results in terms of incidents of conflict and violence in the classroom?

ÅB: Such evaluation attempts have not been part of your own studies?

PH: No, but there's beginning to be more pressure on me to do that.

I've answered your main question in terms of content in the classroom. But there is also the more difficult issue of convincing school personnel. I think a lot of people, as I said, are motivated and really feel a need to have programs on peace education, but I find that it's still hard to get whole school systems to implement programs of peace education. Dedicated teachers who care about peace issues do implement programs in their own classrooms and maybe sometimes enlist some other teachers in their schools, but it may be very hard to actually implement peace education on a large scale, persuading a whole state, for example. At least in this country there is a lot of struggling around it.

6.

ÅB: What would be some of the possible differences in peace education approaches among younger and older students in schools?

PH: In our research on enemy images we find that young children, 4 to 6 year olds, spontaneously think of a monster when you ask them to talk about enemies. So an enemy is one monster or sometimes one person who is threatening, whereas 7-9 year-olds think of enemies as bullies in their school, with whom they have some kind of relationship of enmity.

Because of these findings I have begun to think that with younger children, that is children at the kindergarden age and maybe in the early elementary grades, one should perhaps restrict peace education to their individual, personal, very concrete conflicts in the classroom. I feel I haven't resolved this completely in my mind, but maybe with 5-year-olds and 7-year-olds it makes more sense to them if you help them deal with their own conflicts in the classroom. There they get into a fight with somebody – I hate you, I hate you – and this person is all mad and evil. Maybe it would be most useful to them if we actually helped them to see that perhaps the other person is angry at them too etc. So I think one could lay down some type of foundation of peace education in any grade that maybe isn't so international but focuses on peaceful management of the classroom and classroom conflicts.

Now, if you happen to have a multi-cultural classroom and kids from different racial groups, you may get a fair amount of very personal conflicts between groups in your classroom. So, in other words, you may have a black child fighting with a white child, and they may start yelling at each other: You nigger etc. If you have a multi-cultural classroom, I mean, that's the most elegant way of teaching children interpersonal conflict resolution skills that are already tied to teaching about other cultures and other groups, but through the interactions of specific individuals.

One thing we have done is that we have already immersed very young children in education about other cultures, but it's not quite clear how it's working. We travel around the world on the globe with young children. We expose children to flags of other countries, to pictures of people in other countries. But it's not quite clear how much of it they take in, it's not clear how much of it they understand, because there is some confusion for them about people inside of America and outside of America etc.

About the age of 10-11-12 it's different. We find in our research that that's the age when children begin to talk about conflicts between groups, begin to talk about war, begin to be curious about the origins of war. So somehow I believe that a real discussion of conflicts beyond the classroom that concern different nations maybe can begin in a really meaningful way only in late childhood. Then I would really talk about other nations, war

and conflicts from a more historical perspective.

But that doesn't mean I wouldn't expose younger children, if they have questions about international conflicts. It's very confusing in a way, because obviously many younger children became concerned about war when the Gulf war was going on. They had a lot of questions about what was going on, why the troops were there, how far away it was, whether they were going to be affected by the war, whether their parents were going to be safe and things like that. One should try to answer children's questions honestly. But I would have a bias not to overwhelm let's say 7-year-olds or 5-year-olds with details about war, about wars at different times of history and why we have wars and things like that.

ÅB: Are there some additional results from your research on the development of enemy images that you may tell me about?

PH: What we find is that 4-6 year-old children in different countries tend to think of the enemy as one person who is menacing and who tends to be all evil. Children tend to think that this person cannot be good. They tend to deny that they themselves have conflicts or that other people may see them as being enemies to them, so it's very hard for young children to accept that other people could sometimes think that they are bad or evil or that they are trying to be mean or something like that. So young children have a certain rigidity in their views about good and bad. Enemies are all bad, and they can't be good.

Slightly older children, 7-9 year-olds, tend to think of enemies as bullies in their school. These kids sometimes wait for them on their way home and try to beat them up and tease them and call them names. But children do begin to see that they have a relationship of enmity with these boys, in other words that the bullies might also see them as an enemy. There is much more mutuality, and they can actually take the perspective of the bully. At the same time I think it's interesting that children in this age group frequently don't know *why* other people think that they might be an enemy. They always blame the other person for the origin of the fight. He started it, it wasn't me. Or they say: Well, I accidentally punched this person. Their contribution to the conflict wasn't intentional, it was accidental. They have different ways of disowning their own contribution to conflict.

It's definitely the goal of peace education, I think, and something one could really do in a classroom, to encourage children to see how they contribute to conflicts. One should also give children a sense that it's O.K., that we all do that. We all do things that are upsetting to other people, and sometimes we mean to do these things, sometimes we don't, giving children

a sense that we all contribute to conflict. Let's *accept* our responsibility right in the classroom and let's figure out, I mean, how we contribute, because I think once children do that, it's harder for them to blame other people. I think I really would want to make it harder for children to say: It was him, he's the meany, I didn't do anything.

Up to age 10, children tend to "personalize" enemies; they don't describe the enemy as a member of another ethnic group or cultural group or national group. A switch to a perception of enemies as members of other groups tends to happen between 10 and 12. All of a sudden children spontaneously draw the enemy as a group of people or two groups of people who are fighting each other. They begin to draw flags, so somehow they begin to be aware that enmity has something to do with other nations, with other groups and how groups tend to fight each other. So children around age 10 clearly move beyond the personalized enemy, and I think because of that they are more prone to understand conflicts that involve whole groups. Children at that point also begin to assume more responsibility for their own fights with other individuals. So somewhere between 10 or 12 kids begin to say: Oh, yes, other people see me as the enemy, and I know I do lots of things that may be upsetting to other people. I say things that other people don't like etc.

Starting around 13 years of age – in some children it shows up earlier – children seem to move beyond an identification of enmity with either individuals or groups, and seem to begin to show what some people might call a metacognitive awareness – they become social critics and social philosophers and begin to ask: How come we have conflicts? How come we have wars? So at that age children become very reluctant to portray a particular group as enemies or draw another person as the enemy. They might say: I don't really have enemies, and I don't believe, you know, that you should have enemies. They begin to draw collages of conflict, where they almost seem to say: There are different types of conflicts in the world. There are personal conflicts, there are political conflicts between groups, etc. At this point children become very reluctant to stereotype other groups, and they begin to say: Why do we have conflicts anyway? What can we do about war? Therefore I tend to believe that – as social studies teachers may have sensed intuitively – 13-15 year-olds are a wonderful age group to really discuss different types of conflicts, to take up political discussions and to encourage students to become politically active. I think there is a lot that schools could do to encourage children at that age to really proceed to action: doing things in their own classrooms but also in

their own communities that could make a difference or speaking up politically, writing to political leaders in their communities or becoming involved in various projects that actually could change things.

ÅB: When you originally chose your age groups, what were the reasons for these particular ones? You are not studying each separate age level, you compare groups of ages?

PH: Being trained as a developmental psychologist, I have hunches as to where differences might come in. Piaget has actually written a little about children's political development. I had some reason to believe that changes would occur between these groups. Piaget would describe 4-6 year-olds as pre-operational in their thinking, they are much more intuitive, much more spontaneous. So I thought: let's look at 4-6 year-olds as a group and see what they have to say etc.

ÅB: Were the children equally divided into the three age levels within that group of 4 to 6 years?

PH: No, because it's very hard to talk more than very briefly to 4-year-olds, I think most of our subjects in this age group are 5- or 6-year-olds. Among the older children, however, we have an even age distribution within the groups.

ÅB: Were there some sex differences in your results?

PH: There is a certain tendency in our data for young girls to know less about enemies. 4-6-year-old girls frequently haven't heard the word enemy, and when you explain to them what enemies are, they are very reluctant to talk about enemies or to draw enemies. Instead they frequently want to draw good girls, rainbows or other positive things.

Then there are sex differences among the 7-9-year-olds in that boys tend to draw conflicts with other boys, and these tend to be physical conflicts. Girls tend to draw conflicts between girls, but these are frequently more emotional conflicts and verbal quarrels. Girls frequently draw speech-bubbles. So we find some kind of gender segregation in mid-childhood: boys seem to be fighting with boys, and girls seem to be fighting with girls. Many boys, I think, have been told that they are stronger than girls and that they shouldn't beat up girls, that is not a nice thing to do. And I think girls have been told to stay away from boys. They tend to stay away from each other.

In the older age groups – actually primarily among the 10 to 12-year-olds – boys seem to be much freer in their portrayal of intergroup conflict and even seem to sort of enjoy drawing conflicts between groups. They show a lot of shooting and fighting, there are whole armies that march

against each other and groups drop bombs on other groups. I've noticed that some boys really draw these images with great enjoyment. Girls 10-12 years old seem to know as much about enemies and conflict as boys, but seem to be more concerned about the impact or the effects of war, so girls are much more likely than boys to draw graveyards and people who die as a result of war, people who are hurt by war. So girls are also concerned about war and know about war but think more about the victims. Maybe girls continue to personalize conflict more than boys do. I feel that I have to analyze my data more carefully to make that point with confidence, but there is definitely a certain tendency for girls to be more worried about the victims, whereas the boys seem to be more caught up in drawing weapons.

ÅB: Do you work with quantitative content analysis in this research, or do you primarily give illustrative, qualitative descriptions of the children's reactions?

PH: You could see the whole research as predominantly qualitative in its approach, but we definitely also do quantitative analysis of what percentage of children give certain types of reactions. So we have a mixture of qualitative and quantitative techniques in the analyses.

7.

ÅB: If you were an upper-secondary school teacher in a subject with which you are particularly familiar, how would you like to make the students more conscious of and more prepared for problems of peace, within that subject?

PH: I might teach psychology. By the way, we have begun to ask children questions about whether it's possible not to have conflicts. That is, we have started to turn my psychological approach into an educational project, almost creating workshops with children. We ask the same questions to get the kids to reflect on their experience in the classroom and their perception of the world and basically take it from there and then have discussions with children about what they think one could do to prevent conflicts.

To come back to how I tried to answer the question initially, it could be interesting to explore with children and young people their conceptions of human nature, the assumptions they have about people. Are people evil? Are people aggressive? What does aggression lead to? Do you believe that you will always have conflicts with other people? Do you believe that countries will always have conflicts with each other? And I found that even 10-12-year olds, and then definitely the older group, are really intrigued by these questions and have a lot to say. In a class on psychology maybe I

would begin with some kind of workshop, where I ask the students about their opinions about human nature, about group conflicts. Then, with 14-15-year-olds, I would try to introduce different psychological theories; for example, you could talk about Freud and his conception that all human beings are aggressive. I would proceed to other theories in psychology that claim that we learn to be aggressive in our environment, so if we grow up in a world that is not peaceful we learn not to be peaceful. In their spontaneous responses about human nature children basically reproduce all major theories of psychology, which is really fascinating.

ÅB: Would you try to promote one of these theories, or how would you deal with this situation to make it a peace education effort?

PH: I would probably explore with the students what the implications for peace education would be of each of those approaches. Given the assumptions of each approach, how would we set up peace education? If all human beings are aggressive, how do you set up peace education? If we believe in social learning theories, how can we create environments that are cooperative, and how can we create all these social models for children that help them to become peaceful? I think that's something you couldn't do quite successfully with kids until they are about 14-15-16 years old. On the other hand, I have always found that younger children as well have always responded very favourably to questions that encourage them to be creative.

8.

ÅB: In international debates, the terms "disarmament education" and "peace education" have been used, in addition to some other related terms ("global education", "education for international understanding" etc.). Do you have any comments and preferences as to this terminology?

PH: I think that "disarmament education" is too specific. I like "global education", because it acknowledges that we want children and adolescents to move beyond their own egocentric and ethnocentric concerns, and that we want them to be concerned about the future of the world, the future of all nations.

ÅB: What about "peace education"? Is that a term you use in communicating with teachers or colleagues?

PH: It's funny. I used to use "peace education", but I think it has recently become a little bit harder, and let me tell you why. I have been interested in conflict resolution. I have also become more interested in media literacy education, which is a whole field in its own right. Then, because this country is turning totally multi-cultural, I have been interested in multi-

cultural education. "Peace education" would be wonderful as a term as long as we make it clear that peace education involves all of these different aspects. All these specialities are ultimately related, so I think I'm searching for a word or some way of referring to all of them, but there seems to be no such term.

9.

ÅB: In many countries, questions related to disarmament and peace are highly controversial. Would you anticipate any difficulties, for example with parents or other members of the community, when introducing peace education in schools? If so, what kind of difficulties? Do you see any way out of such problems?

PH: Let me tell you an anecdote in response to that: Debra, whom you met yesterday and who is the first grade teacher I have been working with, has made it an option for children to salute the flag. They don't have to pledge allegiance to the U.S.A., but they can pledge allegiance to the Earth. That led to reactions from some parents in the community that she was an atheist, that she wasn't patriotic enough and that basically she was an anarchist. So I'm definitely aware that parents can be quite apprehensive about some of the things we do in the classroom. I have also been aware that there are lots of difficult issues you have to deal with. For example, when the Persian Gulf War was going on, and there were children in the classroom whose parents, uncles or aunts were actually soldiers in the Gulf, it was very difficult to conduct peace education in the classroom that didn't make those relatives look bad. It is a real challenge in the classroom to say: "We are against violence, we don't want war", but to make sure at the same time that those children whose relatives are actually in the military don't feel alienated.

I think the way we try to deal with such issues is by talking to parents and other teachers about their ideals and, I think, by talking to people about the fact that nobody wants war, nobody wants their children to be exposed to war; everybody believes in democratic, non-violent solutions to conflicts. I think we've been quite successful in appealing both to parents and to other teachers at that level, and in acknowledging that historically there have been times when it has been very hard to use peaceful means of conflict resolution.

But I think it can also be an interesting chance to make children in the classroom aware that different people have different opinions about war. During the Gulf War we could acknowledge in the classroom that some

adults strongly believe that the war was the right thing, but at the same time there were plenty of other people who believed that you shouldn't go to war under any circumstances. There are groups out there that we disagree with. At the same time it should be part of our ideal not to turn them into our enemy but to keep talking with them and maybe to encourage a more peaceful exchange of views. But it's definitely difficult.

10.

ÅB: What needs to be done in teacher training in order to prepare future teachers more adequately for the area of "peace education"?

PH: It should be part of teacher training to take courses in conflict resolution. Student teachers should learn how to encourage age-appropriate conflict resolution skills and take classes on children's political development, how to foster children's political awareness and how to foster children's sense of political responsibility. As part of the schooling in democratic countries, I think it's important for teachers to know what we can actually do to foster skills in children that make them competent participants in a democratic process. That's something I have become really concerned about here, because in the course of my media research I see how much propaganda children are exposed to. Children's education is not democratic, because they are not truly exposed to a whole range of positions or opinions, but are frequently indoctrinated with information; they are not given alternatives to choose between. Teachers should know about multi-cultural education and definitely receive some kind of media literacy training, a training that enables teachers to encourage children to analyze messages from different media critically.

ÅB: Are these things – that you now say are important for teacher training – already within teacher training in the U.S. or are they usually not?

PH: In some places, like the college I am teaching at, they are. My college is very much committed to multi-cultural education and employs researchers who study the political development of children. So I feel I'm working in an environment where there is a strong commitment to train teachers to be peace educators, but I don't think that's generally the case. I feel there are some programs in this country that are very much committed to issues of peace and justice, but not many. Most of them are, I guess, in small private colleges.

ÅB: Are in-service courses given in this area?

PH: There are some, but I feel I don't know enough about it. I know that there are some school systems that actually bring in Educators for Social

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Responsibility for in-service training, and I know that Educators for Social Responsibility all over the country has link-ups to schools, even through individual teachers who sort of spread the word. I go to quite a few conferences of educators at the state or national level, and I have a sense that some of these conferences are attended by many teachers and have a lot of workshops on peace education, environmental education, and multi-cultural education, but I cannot tell you what precentage of teachers actually attend these workshops. There are definitely opportunities for teachers to learn about peace education, but I guess the spread is somewhat limited.

11.

ÅB: In many schools, the students represent a variety of nationalities and cultural backgrounds. To what extent would it be possible to use this fact as an aid in education for peace? Would you expect some difficulties in doing so?

PH: As I said before, I think it's helpful to have multi-cultural classrooms already in pre-school, because the children get so used to each other in this co-existence of cultures that there's a lot less racial tension. Ideally, teachers in those classrooms should draw on the families, like the grandmothers and the parents of the children from these various racial cultural backgrounds, inviting them to come to the classroom and really be part of it – maybe show the kids games, recipes etc. from their cultures. There is a lot of research in social psychology that demonstrates that what people are familiar with they tend to like better.

ÅB: What about the other aspect of my question: Would you expect some difficulties in using this multi-cultural perspective as a component of education for peace?

PH: There is definitely some resistance among parents in communities to become fully multi-cultural. There are still lots of issues involving bussing and the integration of neighbourhoods in this country, so I think it might take a lot of convincing parents in communities that it's in their best interest to create fully multi-cultural classrooms. There is definitely some reluctance among whites in this country right now to let go of their majority status. As researchers maybe we can use arguments with people and demonstrate that a lot of tension could be avoided through truly multi-cultural education, and that this is also in the best interest of the majority.

ÅB: Might there also be difficulties within the *classroom* in utilizing this

multi-cultural situation for educational purposes?

PH: Yes. I have painted this ideal picture of kids being raised together from day one, but chances are that we create multi-cultural classrooms at later points in children's development. White children may be put together with black children or Hispanic children when they enter elementary school, but those children may never have met before. So chances are that there will be racial tensions in the classroom. The real chance could be to accept that those conflicts will occur, and I think that's a real challenge for peace educators. Are we willing to deal with those tensions sympathetically and professionally? I think it can pose a real challenge to our role as teachers to prove that we are. It may bring us in touch with our own prejudices and with our own tendencies to blame others.

The book "White Teacher", by Vivian Paley, published by Harvard Press, is interesting in this context. The Jewish, white teacher had been teaching all-white classrooms, but then moved to Chicago and had to deal with mixed and predominantly black classrooms. She found that she was trying to ignore the colour differences in her classroom, trying very hard to treat all children equally. Then all of a sudden, she found that the black kids were totally acting up, doing all sorts of disruptive things in her classroom. She realized that was because she was ignoring their culture – the difference between her and them. It's fascinating to follow her struggle in making her classroom fully multi-cultural, acknowledging the differences.

12.

ÅB: Sometimes the term "global survival" is used to refer to an area dealing both with the risks of nuclear war and the risks of far-reaching environmental damage through pollution and overuse of resources. How do you look upon dealing with these two categories of risks together in school? Do you have any suggestions as to how the teacher could approach the problem area of environmental damage?

PH: It's interesting because I have always looked at these issues together. This is in part because of my research on enemy images, because I find that adolescents frequently draw both nuclear war and environmental destruction as the enemy. Because of children's responses I think I have always been inclined to see these two together, whether it's destruction through nuclear weapons, or through radiation from nuclear power plants, or some other form of environmental destruction.

There is a temporal component. I have two sets of data from Germany,

collected at different points of time. In the first set, kids drew a lot more nuclear weapons and Soviet and American flags and other indicators of superpower conflict. That was a real theme about three years ago. In the later set of data the nuclear theme has been partly replaced by concerns about the environment. There are still adolescents who draw missiles, and clearly adolescents are aware that all these nuclear missiles are still around. But I would say that the threat to the world environment that was posed by destruction through nuclear arms a few years ago has been partly replaced by adolescents' awareness that we are equally threatened right now by environmental destruction. These two groups share a global concern.

I think that is basically what the issues of nuclear deterrence or nuclear destruction on the one hand, and environmental destruction on the other, have in common. They are all global issues that concern the whole species, and so they should be discussed together, in courses on peace education.The way to link them would be by exploring the history of armaments. What got the arms race started? We should look at the weapon industry and the whole military industrial complex. But then we should also look at developments in technology in general and at the belief in technological solutions and the total disregard of human and environmental consequences as well as the side-effects of this belief in technological perfection and technological solutions. So I think one could show the linkage between those issues, show that they are related and that they are almost different aspects of a problem complex.

At the same time, I have some problem with this whole notion of, or terminology of, survival: nuclear survival and environmental survival. It sounds almost too hopeless. I would prefer to talk about peace-building efforts. I look at peace education as something that should start very early, and that should be brought into children's education and family life throughout their lives. With this progressive peace building, maybe we don't have to be so worried about survival, because we have more confidence in our ability to actually prevent conflicts. In educational efforts at least, we would probably be more successful if we avoided emphasizing the negative aspects too much.

"Peace Education Miniprints" are published and distributed by the R&D Group "Preparedness for Peace" (address: School of Education, Box 23501, S-200 45 Malmö, Sweden).

At present "Peace Education Miniprints" will also function as aids in the networking activities of PEC/IPRA (the Peace Education Commission of the International Peace Research Association).

ISSN 1101-6418

BEST COPY AVAILABLE